arXiv:1610.09039v1 [math-ph] 27 Oct 2016

Ground state properties of the Holstein-Hubbard model

Tadahiro Miyao

October 31, 2016

Abstract

We study the ground state properties of the Holstein-Hubbard model on some bipartite lattices at half-filling. The ground state is proved to exhibit ferromagnetism whenever the electron-phonon interaction is not so strong. In addition, the ferrimagnetic long range order is shown to exist in the ground state. In contrast to this, we prove the absence of the long range charge order.

To explain ferromagnetism from the Hubbard model is known as a challenging problem. Since the discovery of the Nagaoka-Thouless ferromagnetism [1], there has been significant progress in this field; Lieb [2], Mielke [3] and Tasaki [4] constructed rigorous examples of ferromagnetic ground states in certain Hubbard models. However, the origin of ferromagnetism is still incompletely understood.

In the presence of electron-electron Coulomb and electron-phonon interaction, correlated electron systems provide an attractive field of study. The Holstein-Hubbard model is a simple model describing the interplay of electron-electron and electron-phonon interactions. Despite its importance, rigorous results of ferromagnetism in the Holstein-Hubbard model are rare. In [5], Miyao proved that the ground state of the Holstein-Hubbard model on some bipartite lattices at half-filling is unique whenever the electron-phonon interaction is not so strong. In the present paper, we prove that the unique ground state exhibits ferromagnetism (Theorem 3). As far as we know, this is a first rigorous example of ferromagnetism in the Holstein-Hubbard model. In addition, we prove both existence of antiferromagnetic long range order (Theorem 4) and the absence of the long range charge order (Theorem 5) in the ground state.

The Hamiltonian of the Holstein–Hubbard model on a finite lattice Λ is given by

$$H = \sum_{x,y\in\Lambda}\sum_{\sigma\in\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}} t_{xy}c^*_{x\sigma}c_{y\sigma} + \sum_{x,y\in\Lambda}\frac{U_{xy}}{2}(n_x-1)(n_y-1) + \sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} g_{xy}n_x(b^*_y+b_y) + \sum_{x\in\Lambda}\omega b^*_x b_x, \tag{1}$$

where $c_{x\sigma}$ is the electron annihilation operator at site x and b_x is the phonon annihilation operator at site x. These operators satisfy the following relations: $\{c_{x\sigma}, c^*_{x'\sigma'}\} = \delta_{\sigma\sigma'}\delta_{xx'}$, $[b_x, b^*_{x'}] = \delta_{xx'}$, where δ_{xy} is the Kronecker delta. n_x is the fermionic number operator at site $x \in \Lambda$ defined by $n_x = \sum_{\sigma\in\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}} n_{x\sigma}$, $n_{x\sigma} = c^*_{x\sigma}c_{x\sigma}$. t_{xy} is the hopping matrix element, U_{xy} is the energy of the Coulomb interaction, and g_{xy} is the strength of the electron-phonon interaction. We assume that $\{g_{xy}\}, \{t_{xy}\}$ and $\{U_{xy}\}$ are real symmetric $|\Lambda| \times |\Lambda|$ matrices [6]. The phonons are assumed to be dispersionless with energy $\omega > 0$.

Remarks. — At a first glance, it appears that the Coulomb interaction term in (1) is not standard, however, we can show that our Coulomb interaction is equivalent to the standard one under reasonable assumptions [7].

We say that there is a *bond* between x and y if $t_{xy} \neq 0$. We impose the following conditions on Λ:

(A. 1) Λ is connected, namely, there is a connected path of bonds between every pairs of sites.

(A. 2) Λ is bipartite, namely, Λ can be divided into two disjoint sites A and B such that $t_{xy} = 0$ whenever $x, y \in A$ or $x, y \in B$.

The number of electrons is denoted by N. Since we are interested in the ground state properties of H at half-filling, we assume the following:

(A. 3) $N = |\Lambda|$, where $|\Lambda|$ is the number of sites in Λ.

As to the electron-phonon interaction, we assume the following condition:

(A. 4) $\sum_{x\in\Lambda} g_{xy}$ is a constant independent of $y \in \Lambda$.

Remarks.—(i) An example satisfying **(A. 4)** is $g_{xy} = g_0\delta_{xy}$.

(ii) Let us consider a linear chain of $2L$ atoms with periodic boundary conditions. We set $\Lambda = \{x_j\}_{j=1}^{2L}$. Assume that $|x_j - x_{j+1}| =$ constant for all

j, where $x_{2L+1} = x_1$. If g_{xy} is a function of $|x-y|$, i.e., $g_{xy} = f(|x-y|)$, then **(A. 4)** is satisfied. Similarly, if Λ has a symmetric structure, like C_{60} fullerene, then **(A. 4)** is fulfilled.

The effective Coulomb interaction is given by the following equation:

$$U_{\mathrm{eff},xy} = U_{xy} - \frac{2}{\omega}\sum_{z\in\Lambda} g_{xz}g_{yz}. \tag{2}$$

Let $S_x^{(+)} = c_{x\uparrow}^* c_{x\downarrow}$ and let $S_x^{(-)} = (S_x^{(+)})^*$. The total spin operators are defined by $S^{(3)} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\Lambda}(n_{x\uparrow} - n_{x\downarrow})$, $S^{(+)} = \sum_{x\in\Lambda} S_x^{(+)}$, $S^{(-)} = \sum_{x\in\Lambda} S_x^{(-)}$ and $S_{\mathrm{tot}}^2 = (S^{(3)})^2 + \frac{1}{2}S^{(+)}S^{(-)} + \frac{1}{2}S^{(-)}S^{(+)}$. In [5], Miyao proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.— Assume that $|\Lambda|$ is even. Assume **(A. 1)**—**(A. 4)**. Assume that $\{U_{\mathrm{eff},xy}\}$ is positive definite [8]. For each $M \in \{-|\Lambda|/2, -|\Lambda|/2+1, \ldots, |\Lambda|/2\}$, the ground state of H is unique in each $S^{(3)} = M$ subspace. Let φ_M be the unique ground state of H in the $S^{(3)} = M$ subspace. Then the following holds:

$$\left\langle \varphi_M | S_x^{(+)} S_y^{(-)} \varphi_M \right\rangle \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{if } x, y \in A \text{ or } x, y \in B \\ < 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Remarks.— Consider the case where $U_{xy} = U_0\delta_{xy}$ and $g_{xy} = g_0\delta_{xy}$. In this case, H becomes the standard Holstein-Hubbard model. $\{U_{\mathrm{eff},xy}\}$ is positive definite if and only if $|g_0| < \sqrt{\omega U_0/2}$, i.e., the electron-phonon interaction is not so strong.

From Theorem 1, we can derive an extension of the Lieb's theorem [2]. Let H_{H} be the extended Hubbard model defined by

$$H_{\mathrm{H}} = \sum_{x,y\in\Lambda}\sum_{\sigma\in\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}} t_{xy} c_{x\sigma}^* c_{y\sigma} + \sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} \frac{U_{xy}}{2}(n_x - 1)(n_y - 1). \tag{4}$$

Theorem 2.— Assume that $|\Lambda|$ is even. Assume **(A. 1)**—**(A. 4)**. Assume that $\{U_{xy}\}$ is positive definite. Then the ground state of H_{H} is unique apart from the trivial $(2S+1)$-degeneracy and has spin $S = \frac{1}{2}\big||B| - |A|\big|$.

Proof of Theorem 2.— Putting $g_{xy} = 0$ in Theorem 1, the ground state of H_{H} in the $S^{(3)} = 0$ subspace is unique. For each $U_0 \geq 0$, let $H_{\mathrm{H}}(U_0) = H_{\mathrm{H}} + \sum_{x\in\Lambda} U_0(n_x - 1)^2$. Since $\{U_{xy}\}$ is positive definite, so is $\{U_{xy} + 2U_0\delta_{xy}\}$. Thus, the ground state of $H_{\mathrm{H}}(U_0)$ in the $S^{(3)} = 0$ subspace is unique for all $U_0 \geq 0$. By the continuity, the value of S of the ground state of $H_{\mathrm{H}}(U_0)$ in the $S^{(3)} = 0$ subspace is independent of U_0.

Let $P = \prod_{x\in\Lambda}(n_{x\uparrow} - n_{x\downarrow})^2$. Then it is known that

$$\|\{\mathscr{W}U_0 H_{\rm H}(U_0)\mathscr{W}^{-1} - h\}P\| \to 0 \quad \text{as } U_0 \to \infty, \tag{5}$$

where h is the Heisenberg model defined by $h = \sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} J_{xy}(\mathbf{S}_x \cdot \mathbf{S}_y - \frac{1}{4})$ with $J_{xy} = 2t_{xy}^2$ and $\mathscr{W}$ is the Schrieffer-Wolf transformation. By Lieb-Mattis theorem [9], the ground state of hP is unique and this state has $S = \frac{1}{2}\big||A| - |B|\big|$. Since the ground state of $\mathscr{W}U_0 H_{\rm H}(U_0)\mathscr{W}^{-1}$ converges to that of hP, the value S of the ground state of $H_{\rm H}(U_0)$ must be identical to that of hP. Q.E.D.

Theorem 3.— Assume that $|\Lambda|$ is even. Assume **(A. 1)**—**(A. 4)**. Assume that $\{U_{{\rm eff},xy}\}$ is positive definite. Then the ground state of H is unique apart from the trivial $(2S+1)$-degeneracy and has spin $S = \frac{1}{2}\big||B| - |A|\big|$.

Remarks.– Theorem 3 claims that Lieb's ferromagnetism (Theorem 2) is stable whenever the electron-phonon interaction is not so strong.

Proof of Theorem 3.— In this proof, we work in the $S^{(3)} = 0$ subspace, because $S^{(3)}$ and $S_{\rm tot}^2$ are conserved. Because the boson operators are unbounded, the proof has to be addressed carefully.

For each $\theta \in [1,\infty)$, let H_θ be the Hamiltonian H with ω replaced by $\theta\omega$. Of course, $H_{\theta=1} = H$. Since the matrix $\{\frac{2}{\omega}\sum_{z\in\Lambda} g_{xz}g_{yz}\}_{x,y}$ is positive semidefinite [8], the matrix $\{U_{xy} - \frac{2}{\theta\omega}\sum_{z\in\Lambda} g_{xz}g_{yz}\}_{x,y}$ is positive definite for all $\theta \geq 1$ [10]. Therefore, by Theorem 1, the ground state of H_θ in the $S^{(3)} = 0$ subspace is unique for all $\theta \geq 1$.

The Lang-Firsov transformation [11] is defined by e^L with

$$L = \theta^{-1}\omega^{-1}\sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} g_{xy} n_x (b_y^* - b_y). \tag{6}$$

Set $H'_\theta = e^L H_\theta e^{-L}$. We can express H'_θ as $H'_\theta = H_{\rm H} + \Delta_\theta + \theta\omega N_{\rm b}$, where $N_{\rm b} = \sum_{x\in\Lambda} b_x^* b_x$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_\theta = &\sum_{x,y\in\Lambda}\sum_{\sigma\in\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}} t_{xy}(e^{i\Phi_{xy}} - 1)c_{x\sigma}^* c_{y\sigma} \\ &- \sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} V_{xy}(n_x - 1)(n_y - 1)\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

with $\Phi_{xy} = \theta^{-1}\omega^{-1}\sum_{z\in\Lambda}(g_{xz} - g_{yz})(b_z^* - b_z)$ and $V_{xy} = \theta^{-1}\omega^{-1}\sum_{z\in\Lambda} g_{xz}g_{yz}$.

Lemma.— $\|\Delta_\theta(H_{\rm H} + \theta\omega N_{\rm b} - z)^{-1}\| \leq C\theta^{-1}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R}$, where C is a positive constant independent of θ.

We will prove Lemma in the next part.

By Lemma and the fact $\|(H'_\theta - z)^{-1}\| \leq |\mathrm{Im}z|^{-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(H'_\theta - z)^{-1} - (H_{\mathrm{H}} + \theta\omega N_{\mathrm{b}} - z)^{-1}\| \\
&= \|(H'_\theta - z)^{-1}\Delta_\theta(H_{\mathrm{H}} + \theta\omega N_{\mathrm{b}} - z)^{-1}\| \\
&\leq C|\mathrm{Im}z|^{-1}\theta^{-1} \to 0
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

as $\theta \to \infty$ for every $z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, we obtain that

$$\|(H_{\mathrm{H}} + \theta\omega N_{\mathrm{b}} - z)^{-1} - (H_{\mathrm{H}} - z)^{-1} \otimes P_\Omega\| \to 0 \tag{9}$$

as $\theta \to \infty$, where $P_\Omega = |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|$ with Ω, the bosonic Fock vacuum. To see this, observe that $(H_{\mathrm{H}} + \theta\omega N_{\mathrm{b}} - z)^{-1}P_\Omega = (H_{\mathrm{H}} - z)^{-1} \otimes P_\Omega$. In addition, we have, by using the fact $\|(\theta\omega N_{\mathrm{b}} - z)^{-1}P_\Omega^\perp\| \leq |\theta\omega - z|^{-1}$ with $P_\Omega^\perp = 1 - P_\Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|(H_{\mathrm{H}} + \theta\omega N_{\mathrm{b}} - z)^{-1}P_\Omega^\perp\right\| \\
&= \left\|\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\{(\theta\omega N_{\mathrm{b}} - z)^{-1}H_{\mathrm{H}}\}^n(\theta\omega N_{\mathrm{b}} - z)^{-1}P_\Omega^\perp\right\| \\
&\leq \Big(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}|\mathrm{Im}z|^{-n}\|H_{\mathrm{H}}\|^n\Big)|\theta\omega - z|^{-1} \to 0
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

as $\theta \to \infty$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R}$ such that $|\mathrm{Im}\, z|$ is large enough. By (8) and (9), we conclude that

$$\|(H_{\mathrm{H}} - z)^{-1} \otimes P_\Omega - (H'_\theta - z)^{-1}\| \to 0 \tag{11}$$

as $\theta \to \infty$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R}$ such that $|\mathrm{Im}z|$ is large enough. By a general theorem [12, Theorem VIII. 19], this holds for *all* $z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R}$.

Let $E_0(\theta)$ and $E_1(\theta)$ be the ground state energy and the first excited energy of H'_θ in the $S^{(3)} = 0$ subspace, respectively. By the above arguments, we know that $E_0(\theta)$ converges to E_0, the ground state energy of H_{H}, and $E_1(\theta)$ converges to E_1, the first excited energy of H_{H} as $\theta \to \infty$, respectively. $E_0(\theta)$ and $E_1(\theta)$ never coincide for all $\theta \geq 1$. [Proof: Assume that there exists a $\theta_0 \geq 1$ such that $E_0(\theta_0) = E_1(\theta_0)$. Then the uniqueness of the ground states breaks down at $\theta = \theta_0$, which is a contradiction.] Thus, since $E_1 - E_0 > 0$, we get $\delta := \inf_{\theta\geq 1}|E_1(\theta) - E_0(\theta)| > 0$.

Let ψ_θ be the ground state of H'_θ and let ψ be the ground state of H_{H}. By (11) and the following formulas for θ sufficiently large :

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_\theta\rangle\langle\psi_\theta| &= \frac{i}{2\pi}\int_{|E-E_0|=\delta/2}(H'_\theta - E)^{-1}dE, \\
|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes P_\Omega &= \frac{i}{2\pi}\int_{|E-E_0|=\delta/2}(H_{\mathrm{H}} - E)^{-1} \otimes P_\Omega dE,
\end{aligned}$$

we have $\|\psi_\theta - \psi\otimes\Omega\| \to 0$ as $\theta\to\infty$. Remark that the value of S of ψ_θ must be independent of θ because the ground state of H'_θ is unique for all $\theta \geq 1$. Since the ground state $\psi\otimes\Omega$ has spin $S = \frac{1}{2}\big||B| - |A|\big|$ by Theorem 2, so does ψ_θ due to the continuity. Q.E.D.

Proof of Lemma.— Let

$$T = \sum_{x,y\in\Lambda}\sum_{\sigma\in\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}} t_{xy}(e^{i\Phi_{xy}} - 1)c^*_{x\sigma}c_{y\sigma}. \tag{12}$$

Since $\|(e^{iA} - 1)\phi\| \leq \|A\phi\|$ for any self-adjoint operator A, we have

$$\|T\phi\| \leq Const. \sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} \|\Phi_{xy}\phi\|, \tag{13}$$

where $Const.$ is independent of θ. Using the well-known bounds [13]: $\|b_x\phi\| \leq \|(N_{\rm b}+1)\phi\|$ and $\|b^*_x\phi\| \leq \|(N_{\rm b}+1)\phi\|$, we have

$$\|\Phi_{xy}\phi\| \leq Const.\,\theta^{-1}\|(N_{\rm b}+1)\phi\|. \tag{14}$$

Combining (13) and (14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|T\phi\| &\leq Const.\,\theta^{-1}\|(N_{\rm b}+1)\phi\| \\ &\leq Const.\,\theta^{-1}\{\|(H_{\rm H} + \theta\omega N_{\rm b} - z)\phi\| + \|\phi\|\}. \end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

Since $\|\sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} V_{xy}(n_x - 1)(n_y - 1)\| \leq Const.\,\theta^{-1}$, we arrive at $\|\Delta_\theta\phi\| \leq C\theta^{-1}\{\|(H_{\rm H} + \theta\omega N_{\rm b} - z)\phi\| + \|\phi\|\}$. Q.E.D.

Let $\hat{S}^{(+)}_0 = |\Lambda|^{-1/2}\sum_{x\in\Lambda} S^{(+)}_x$ and let $\hat{S}^{(+)}_Q = |\Lambda|^{-1/2}\sum_{x\in\Lambda}\gamma(x)S^{(+)}_x$, where $\gamma(x) = 1$ if $x\in A$, $\gamma(x) = -1$ if $x\in B$. The correlation functions are given by $m(k) = \left\langle \hat{S}^{(+)}_k \big(\hat{S}^{(+)}_k\big)^* \right\rangle$ for $k = 0$ or Q, where $\langle\cdot\rangle$ is the ground state expectation.

Theorem 4.— Assume that $|\Lambda|$ is even. Assume **(A. 1)**—**(A. 4)**. Assume that $\{U_{{\rm eff},xy}\}$ is positive definite. If $\big||A| - |B|\big| = const.|\Lambda|$, then $m(Q) \geq m(0) = O(|\Lambda|)$. Thus, the antiferromagnetic and ferromagnetic long range order coexist in the ground state.

Proof of Theorem 4.— We follow [14]. By Theorem 1, we obtain that $m(0) = |\Lambda|^{-1}\sum_{x,y}\langle S^{(+)}_x S^{(-)}_y\rangle \leq |\Lambda|^{-1}\sum_{x,y}\gamma(x)\gamma(y)\langle S^{(+)}_x S^{(-)}_y\rangle = m(Q)$. Since $m(0) = O(\Lambda)$ by Theorem 3, we conclude the assertions in Theorem 4. Q.E.D.

Finally, we present a theorem on the charge susceptibility. For simplicity, we assume that Λ is the d-dimensional cubic lattice with a periodic boundary condition. However, our result still holds in general periodic lattices, including the Lieb lattice. Let $q_x = n_x - 1$. The charge susceptibility (at $\beta = \infty$) with the wave vector k is given by

$$\chi_k = \left\langle \hat{q}_k (H - E)^{-1} \hat{q}_{-k} \right\rangle, \tag{16}$$

where $\hat{q}_k = |\Lambda|^{-1/2} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} e^{-ik \cdot x} q_x$ and E is the ground state energy of H.

Theorem 5.— Assume that $|\Lambda|$ is even. Assume that g_{xy} and U_{xy} are translation invariant [15]. Assume **(A. 3)**. Assume that $\{U_{\mathrm{eff},xy}\}$ is positive semidefinite. Then we have $\chi(k) \le \hat{U}_{\mathrm{eff}}(k)$. Thus, if there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that $\hat{U}_{\mathrm{eff}}(k) \ge c_0$, then there is no long range charge order.

Remarks.— (i) Since $\{U_{\mathrm{eff},xy}\}$ is positive semidefinite, we have $\hat{U}_{\mathrm{eff}}(k) \ge 0$.

(ii) Theorems 4 and 5 suggest that coexistence of the ferromagnetic and the charge long range orders would be impossible. For instance, consider the model on the Lieb lattice with $U_{xy} = U_0 \delta_{xy}$ and $g_{xy} = g_0 \delta_{xy}$. Suppose that $|g_0| < \sqrt{\omega U_0 / 2}$. By Theorem 5, we have $\chi(k) \le (U_0 - 2g_0^2/\omega)^{-1}$, which implies the absence of the long range charge order. On the other hand, Theorem 4 claims the coexistence of the ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic long range orders.

Proof of Theorem 5.— We provide a sketch only. We apply Kubo-Kishi argument [16], which originates from [17], see also [18]. For each $\mathbf{h} = \{h_x\}_{x \in \Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda}$, let $H'(\mathbf{h})$ be the Hamiltonian $H'_{\theta=1}$ with $U_{\mathrm{eff}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda} U_{\mathrm{eff},xy} (n_{x\uparrow} - n_{x\downarrow})(n_{y\uparrow} - n_{y\downarrow})$ replaced by $U_{\mathrm{eff}}(\mathbf{h}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda} U_{\mathrm{eff},xy} (n_{x\uparrow} - n_{x\downarrow} + h_x)(n_{y\uparrow} - n_{y\downarrow} + h_y)$. Clearly, we have $H'(\mathbf{0}) = H'_{\theta=1}$. We denote by $\mathcal{H}$ the $S^{(3)} = 0$ subspace. Let $Z_\beta(\mathbf{h}) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[e^{-\beta H'(\mathbf{h})}]$. Then we can show that $Z_\beta(\mathbf{h}) \le Z_\beta(\mathbf{0})$, see [5] for details. This implies $E(\mathbf{0}) \le E(\mathbf{h})$, where $E(\mathbf{h})$ is the ground state energy of $H'(\mathbf{h})$ in the $S^{(3)} = 0$ subspace. Thus, we get $d^2 E(\lambda \mathbf{h})/d\lambda^2|_{\lambda=0} \le 0$, which implies Theorem 5. Q.E.D.

This work was partially supported by KAKENHI (20554421) and KAKENHI (16H03942).

References

[1] Y. Nagaoka, Phys. Rev. **147**, 392 (1966); D. J. Thouless, Proc. Phys. Soc. London **86**, 893 (1965).

[2] E. H. Lieb, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1201 (1989).

[3] A. Mielke, J. Phys. A **24**, L73 (1991); **24**, 3311(1991); **25**, 4335 (1992); Phys. Lett. A **174**, 443 (1993).

[4] H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1608 (1992); Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4678 (1995); Comm. Math. Phys. **242**, 445 (2003).

[5] T. Miyao, Ann. Henri Poincare, Online First Article (2016).

[6] Let $M = \{M_{xy}\}$ be a $|\Lambda| \times |\Lambda|$ matrix. M is called a *real symmetric matrix* if M_{xy} is real and $M_{xy} = M_{yx}$ for all $x, y \in \Lambda$.

[7] Indeed, if we assume that $\sum_{x\in\Lambda} U_{xy}$ is a constant independent of y, then the Coulomb interaction in (1) becomes $\frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} U_{xy}(n_x - 1)(n_y - 1) = \sum_{x\in\Lambda} U_{xx} n_{x\uparrow} n_{x\downarrow} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\neq y} U_{xy} n_x n_y + Const.$ for every electron filling. A typical example satisfying the assumption about U_{xy} is the case where $U_{xy} = U_0 \delta_{xy}$.

[8] A matrix $\{M_{xy}\}$ will be called *positive semidefinite* if, for all $\{\xi_x\}_{x\in\Lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^{|\Lambda|}\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$, $\sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} \overline{\xi}_x \xi_y M_{xy} \geq 0$ holds. $\{M_{xy}\}$ will be called *positive definite* if $\sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} \overline{\xi}_x \xi_y M_{xy} > 0$ (strict inequality) holds for all $\{\xi_x\}_{x\in\Lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^{|\Lambda|}\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$.

[9] E. H. Lieb, D. Mattis, J. Math. Phys. **3**, 749 (1962).

[10] *Proof.*— Let $M_{xy} = \frac{2}{\omega}\sum_{z\in\Lambda} g_{xz} g_{yz}$. Clearly, $\sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} \overline{\xi}_x \xi_y M_{xy} = \frac{2}{\omega}\sum_{z\in\Lambda} |\sum_{x\in\Lambda} \xi_x g_{xz}|^2 \geq 0$. Hence, $\{M_{xy}\}$ is positive semidefinite.

Since $\{U_{\mathrm{eff},xy}\}$ is positive definite, we have $\sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} \overline{\xi}_x \xi_y U_{\mathrm{eff},xy} > 0$ for all $\{\xi_x\}_{x\in\Lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^{|\Lambda|}\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} \overline{\xi}_x \xi_y (U_{xy} - \theta^{-1} M_{xy}) \\ &= \sum_{x,y\in\Lambda} \overline{\xi}_x \xi_y U_{\mathrm{eff},xy} + (1 - \theta^{-1}) \sum_{z,y\in\Lambda} \overline{\xi}_x \xi_y M_{xy} > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

for all $\{\xi_x\}_{x\in\Lambda} \in \mathbb{C}^{|\Lambda|}\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$. Accordingly, $\{U_{xy} - \theta^{-1} M_{xy}\}$ is positive definite for all $\theta \geq 1$.

[11] I. G. Lang, Y. A. Firsov, Sov. Phys. JETP **16**, 1301 (1963).

[12] M. Reed, B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I: Functional Analysis*, Academic Press, New York, 1980.

[13] *Proof of the bounds.*— Observe that

$$\|b_x\phi\|^2 = \langle\phi|b_x^* b_x\phi\rangle \leq \langle\phi|N_{\rm b}\phi\rangle \leq \|N_{\rm b}\phi\|^2. \tag{18}$$

On the other hand, by the commutation relation $[b_x, b_x^*] = 1$, we have

$$\|b_x^*\phi\|^2 = \|\phi\|^2 + \|b_x\phi\|^2 \leq \|\phi\|^2 + \|N_{\rm b}\phi\|^2. \tag{19}$$

Since $\|N_{\rm b}\phi\| \leq \|(N_{\rm b}+1)\phi\|$ and $\|\phi\|^2 + \|N_{\rm b}\phi\|^2 \leq \|(N_{\rm b}+1)\phi\|^2$, we obtain the desired bounds.

[14] S. Q. Shen, A. M. Qiu, G. S. Tian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1280 (1994).

[15] Namely, it holds that $g_{xy} = g_{x-y,o}$ and $U_{xy} = U_{x-y,o}$.

[16] K. Kubo, T. Kishi, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 4866 (1990).

[17] F. J. Dyson, E. H. Lieb, B. Simon, J. Stat. Phys. **18**, 335 (1978).

[18] T. Kennedy, E.H. Lieb, B. S. Shastry, J. Stat. Phys. **53**, 1019 (1988).